	Case 3:05-cr-00447-CRB	Document 37 Filed 11/16/05 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
12	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. CR 05-00395 CRB
13	Plaintiff,) (PROPOSED) ORDER EXCLUDING TIME FROM SEPTEMBER 7, 2005 TO
14	v.) NOVEMBER 9, 2005 UNDER THE
15	YOUNG JOON YANG, et al.) SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
16	Defendants.	
17		_) No. CR 05-00447 CRB
18	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
19	Plaintiff,	
20	V.	
21	MISUK MOORE, et al.,	
22	Defendants	
23	On September 7, 2005, defendants in the above-captioned matter appeared, with counsel, before the Court for a status conference. Assistant United States Attorney Peter B. Axelrod and Department of Justice Trial Attorney Andrew Kline appeared on behalf of the United States. The parties agreed to a continuance of the matter to November 9, 2005, and a	
24		
25		
26		
2728	corresponding exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act (18 U.S.C. § 3161), to provide	
	defense counsel with sufficient time to obtain and review additional discovery.	
	Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time from September 7, 2005 to	
	ORDER CR 05-00395 CRB/CR 05-00447 CRB	

Case 3:05-cr-00447-CRB Document 37 Filed 11/16/05 Page 2 of 2

November 9, 2005 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161. For the reasons set forth above, the Court finds that the failure to grant the requested exclusion would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Further, the Court finds the exclusion warranted on complexity grounds, under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(ii), based on the number of defendants (34 charged), the number of calls on the wire (exceeding 33,000) and the fact that the vast majority of the calls are in the Korean language. Thus, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested exclusion outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A), (h)(8)(B)(ii) and (h)(8)(B)(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: Nov. 16, 2005

CHAPLES R. BREYER
VANCED STATES

APPROVED

Judge Charles R. Breyer

DISTRICT OF